ceptive to the eye, and which long eluded the test of close examination, and measurement. Sculpture was called into exercise in an extent, and with a success, since unknown; and the subjects, which it illustrated were such, as brought the recollection of the beholder to the early history of his nation, and to the exploits of the deities of his country. The victory in the theatre, or the games, was commemorated in the monument, rather than the victory in the field of war. The Romans, subjugating Greece —struck with the beauty of its architecture, sought to transplant it to their own city. But with them, it was no longer the result of an accurate analysis, and balance of varying forms, and of their effect in juxtaposition, each upon the other. Not content with adopting the forms of Grecian architecture, and enlisting the services of its producers, they transported the buildings themselves to the capital of a subject world. Their earliest structures were in the main Grecian, and sometimes, as in the portico of the Pantheon, were very strongly expressive of that influence. But this comparative brilliant state of the art was of short duration, and soon the Grecian architects appeared to follow the blind dictates of a master, rather than the inward promptings of reason, and good taste. The national characteristics of the Romans— the love of empire, the pomp and vainglory of the triumphal spectacle; the pride of dominion, the opulence, the luxury, and the crime, changed the whole scope and expression of art; the orders of architecture became the mere framework for extravagant enrichments, annihilating the graces of form, and the happy arrangement of contrast, and exchanging the magic of art for the meretricious, and the grandiose. In the supplementary volume of "Stuart's Athens," Mr. Kinnard, speaking of the comparative merits of Grecian and Roman architecture, remarks that "the latter style corresponds with the ponderous bearing of a people, who had subdued the world by their arms; the former with the captivating influence of a nation, that had enlightened the universe by her literature." In Roman architecture, beauty disappeared under a load of riches. Mr. Gandy, in the "Pompeiana," says, "With the Greeks, architectural ornament may be compared with those parasitical plants, which, continually intertwining, climb to the tops of the loftiest trees, and pass from branch to branch without injuring the individual grandeur of character in the various species they embellish;"— "whereas, with the Romans, all distinction of surface was frittered away in an endless maze of fretwork." The love of splendour, identified with the Roman character, exerted its sway and the chaste principles of beauty, exemplified in the Pantheon, were no longer beheld during the pomp of the empire. "Another enemy to the beautiful, and even to the sublime," says Mr. Forsyth,* "was that colossal taste, which arose in the empire, and gave an unnatural expansion to all the works of art. In architecture, it produced Nero's golden house, and Adrian's villa; in hydraulics, it projected the Claudian emissary, and Caligula's Baian bridge; in sculpture, it has left at the capitol such heads and feet, as betray the emperor's contempt for the dimensions of man; in poetry, it swelled out into the hyperboles of Lucan and Statius. This exaggerating spirit spread even to the games. Nero drove ten horses yoked abreast to his car, and double that number appear on an ancient stone."

The distinctive peculiarities of national character are evident in every feature of Roman architecture: they are seen in the almost constant use of the Corinthian order, in the cornices, in which no moulding was without ornament, in the sculptured representations of triumphal processions, and in the construction of immense works for the amusement of the citizens. The cornice of the temple of Jupiter Tonans has a fillet, as the only unornamented moulding; in the arch of Titus the enrichment is of like extent; and in the temple of Jupiter Stator, and in other examples, hardly inferior. The triumphal arches, in every detail of ornament, record the purpose of their erection; they sustained the triumphal chariot of the victor, and shewed portions of the procession. At Baalbec and Palmyra, the resources of decoration were exhausted, whilst the works were of vast extent.—The amphitheatres are mementoes of Roman ostentation and cruelty; they are of great size, the Colosseum being large enough to contain seventy or eighty thousand people, and that of Verona, twenty thousand. They were of an elliptical form, and consisted of the arena, where the combats took place, and ranges of seats surrounding it, easy access to every part of which was gained by numerous passages, and staircases. The outside exhibited several ranges of arches placed one above another. The arena was surrounded by a wall, upon which was the podium, a kind of projecting box, generally highly ornamented; there sat the *editor*, the senators, the vestals, and the magistrates, attended by lictors, and seated in their curule chairs. There was also the suggestum, the seat of the emperor. The podium was never less than twelve feet high, but, as an additional security from the beasts, lattices and gratings were raised, and large rollers contrived, so as to turn, whenever an animal attempted to leap on to them. Afterwards trenches, or canals were dug round the arena. But beasts were not the only victims in the shows of the amphitheatre; slaves were matched against each other, and the Roman ladies were amongst the spectators of the sanguinary exhibition. The calling of gladiator at length became an honourable one, in which senators, and even women, were proud to enlist themselves. The Emperor Commodus was so often victorious in the arena, that he signed himself conqueror of a thousand gladiators. To how low an abyss of degradation must the empire have fallen, when these brutal spectacles became the favourite amusement of the nation. The Romans introduced them into whatever country they subjected to their dominion, thus we find amphitheatres at Rome, Verona, Pompeii, Pola, Nismes, Corinth, and other towns in Italy, Gaul, Germany, and Spain. But the most considerable of all was the Flavian amphitheatre at Rome, and its vast size merits the name Colosseum. It occupies an area of six acres, and was in height nearly 160 feet. At its dedication, in the reign of the Emperor Titus,* the number of beasts destroyed was, according to one author, nine thousand, and after the combats, water was introduced and a sea-fight commenced. The form of the edifice is that of an oval, of which the longer axis is 620 feet, and the shorter 513 feet. The seats are raised over the staircases leading to the several divisions; and it is to be remarked, that the utmost care has been taken to secure the facile egress of a large audience. The building was four orders in height, and there were eighty arches in each of the three lower ranges, the arches in the second and third range being once ornamented with statues. In the upper order of the exterior are blocks for supporting the poles, which sustained the cords of the velarium or awning, the supporting of which over so vast a space, was often a work of extreme difficulty. This awning was sometimes of the richest materials, as of purple spangled with stars. Stupendous as was the fabric, it was constructed from a part only of the materials of Nero's golden house, which was demolished by Vespasian, as too sumptuous for the residence, even of a Roman emperor. Six hundred years had tried its stability, when it suggested the well-known saying "Quamdiu stabit Colisæus, stabit et Roma; quando cadet Colisæus, cadet Roma; quando cadet Roma, cadet et mundus."

"Here (says Mr. Forsyth) sat the conquerors of the world, coolly to enjoy the tortures and death of men, who had never offended them. Two aqueducts were scarcely sufficient to wash off the human blood, which a few hours' sport shed in this imperial shambles. Twice in one day came the senators and matrons of Rome to the butchery; a virgin always gave the signal for slaughter, and when glutted with bloodshed, those ladies sat down in the wet and streaming *arenæ* to a luxurious supper. As it now stands, the Coliseum is a striking image of Rome itself; decayed, vacant, serious, yet grand; half grey and half green, erect on one side and fallen on the other, with consecrated ground in its bosom, inhabited by a bedesman, visited by every caste; for moralists, antiquaries, painters, architects, devotees, all meet here to meditate, to examine, to draw, to measure, and to pray."

Scarcely inferior to the amphitheatres were the magnificent thermæ, which were so numerous, and of such extent, as would defy credibility, did not the remains of those works at present exist. They included apartments for the purposes of the bath, halls for friendly intercourse, academies, theatres, and libraries. They often stood amongst extensive gardens, and walks, and were adorned with all the richness, which art could lavish. They were lined and paved with mosaic, or with marble stained in various hues, and were embellished with the choicest productions of painting and statuary. The life of the Roman citizen may be said to have passed within their walls, and they became a main cause of that enervating influence on the Roman character, which involved the empire in its decline and fall. But it is not meant, that pride of dominion and wealth were the only qualities which the Romans possessed; their skill in the arts of construction was shewn in the sewers, the aqueducts, and other great works, which secured the comfort of the inhabitants of each city, and which are entitled to our admiration. They, also, carried the influence of the arts to the very confines of the empire, and by the Emperor Hadrian, Athens was enriched with many important buildings.

Much of the effect of Roman ornament is lost by the confusion, and jarring of mouldings in immediate contact, profusely decorated. The art of sculpture has the same character, as that of architecture. Unlike the sculpture of Greece, where the simple beauty of the "human form divine" was held superior to any adornment, they arrayed the figure in all the trappings and insignia of office. Their national characteristics alike influenced both arts, and are proved by evidence more convincing than written history, the evidence of thought, of language speaking through the tongue of art. E. H.

* "Remarks on Antiquities, Arts, and Letters, during an excursion in Italy, in the years 1802 and 1803."

* How a good and humane prince could preside at the opening of an amphitheatre, and derive pleasure from the slaughter of men and animals, we leave others to explain; for ourselves, we are doubtful as to the truth of the received opinion. Possibly a Spaniard might not question it.

MODERN CHURCH ARCHITECTURE IN GERMANY.

The following review of a recent work, derived from German sources, will serve as an exponent of opinion in Germany on the subject of style in church architecture. It will be seen that it is widely different from opinion in England on the same point.

Professor Semper, on the building of Protestant (Evangelic) churches— Ueber den Bau evangelischer Kirchen. Dresden, 1845, 8vo.

Under this title the Dresden professor has published a spirited and instructive little work, which is chiefly intended for developing and defending the principles, upon which his project for the rebuilding of the St. Nicolas church, in Hamburg, is based. It turns on the dispute between the adherents to the pointed arches and round arches style, and the author proves by a few concise (yet, as it seems to us, conclusive) reasons, that the former is not adapted by its extent to the wants of Protestant churches, destined chiefly for preaching — that it is incompatible with the erection of galleried churches (*emporkirchen*); that, in fine, this style has been wrongly called the exclusively *national-German*. The pointed arches style, he says—and this is the main feature of Professor Semper's work—has neither been invented, nor exclusively developed in Germany; Italy, England, and France have also adapted this style, each according to their own mind and genius, as the Germans have to theirs. This sort of architecture, therefore, is no more exclusively German than the Byzantine-Roman, to which German genius has as much impressed the stamp of national character as to the Gothic. Just the same as the Nibelungen is nearer to the German mind than the Titurel and the songs of the thirteenth century — the character of the style of round arches is more congenial to our times than that of pointed ones, which is nigh becoming antiquated. The former is more analogous to our scale of civilization, on account of the more varied elements it has received within its sphere, and its principles having attained a more perfect harmony, more analogous to our social condition, containing as it does a significative symbolism of the Christendom, which has come to us from the East, superstructed on notions of antiquity. Our churches

For Info on OCR and PDF Compression visit our website